

## EXPLORING ANTISEMITISM THROUGH LEGAL, POLITICAL, AND LINGUISTIC PERSPECTIVES WITH INSIGHTS ON SHIFTING PERCEPTIONS THROUGH HOLOCAUST EDUCATION

Dr. Bożena Iwanowska

VIZJA University, Poland  
e-mail: [b.iwanowska@vizja.pl](mailto:b.iwanowska@vizja.pl); <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-1331-2866>

Dr. habil. Yan Kapranov, University Professor

VIZJA University, Poland  
e-mail: [y.kapranov@vizja.pl](mailto:y.kapranov@vizja.pl); <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-2915-038X>

Dr. Dawid Stadniczenko

VIZJA University, Poland  
e-mail: [d.stadniczenko@vizja.pl](mailto:d.stadniczenko@vizja.pl); <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-6826-3366>

**Abstract.** This paper explores the enduring issue of antisemitism, framed as “the oldest hatred,” through an interdisciplinary lens that integrates legal, political, and historical perspectives. By examining the persistence and evolution of antisemitism in modern society, the study underscores the importance of Holocaust education as a critical tool for understanding and combating prejudice and discrimination. Grounded in the analysis of existing legal frameworks, including those established by the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) and the European Court of Human Rights, the paper investigates how state policies and linguistic manipulation have historically reinforced antisemitic ideologies. A Polish university academic staff survey reveals educators’ perspectives on Holocaust education’s relevance in contemporary education. The findings highlight the need for a multidimensional approach that fosters critical thinking, societal awareness, and empathy to prevent future atrocities. The study concludes that combining historical awareness, legal knowledge, and ethical engagement in Holocaust education is essential for combating rising antisemitism and fostering a more informed and inclusive society.

**Keywords:** antisemitism; holocaust education; legal perspectives; political dimensions; human rights education.

## INTRODUCTION

The tragic history of the Holocaust, with its profound impact on human rights and societal values, highlights the need for educational strategies that go beyond recounting historical facts to understanding the ideologies behind such atrocities. This paper examines the multifaceted nature of antisemitism, often called the “oldest hatred,” through legal, political, and historical analyses to understand its persistence and evolution in modern society. George Santayana’s warning that “Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it” underpins our investigation into the ongoing relevance of Holocaust education. In a world where geopolitical tensions mirror past conflicts, the importance of teaching the Holocaust extends beyond history, serving as a tool against the resurgence of antisemitism. This paper explores evolving definitions of antisemitism, as discussed by scholars like R.S. Wistrich, and examines the legal frameworks developed to combat it. By integrating law, politics, and history, the authors aim to enhance understanding and education about antisemitism.

### 1. ANTISEMITISM IN LEGAL, POLITICAL AND LINGUISTIC PERSPECTIVE

In scholarly discourse, antisemitism is frequently described as one of the most persistent and complex manifestations of prejudice, encompassing racial, ethnic, and religious dimensions. This characterization underscores its longstanding presence in human history, aptly earning it the designation of the “oldest hatred in the world” [Wistrich 1994, 19]. Specific dimensions of antisemitism stem from hatred towards those deemed other or foreign, frequently reflecting elements of religious extremism and racism. Although comparisons can be made between hostility towards Jews and the historical persecution of various minority groups – including heretics, witches, homosexuals, Roma, and Black individuals – the distinctive sacred and quasi-metaphysical attributes inherent to antisemitism set it apart from other forms of discrimination [Idem 2010, 80].

Historical and political factors, along with linguistic variations, have influenced the development and perpetuation of antisemitic attitudes. Jean-Paul Sartre, an eminent French existentialist, in his essay “Anti-Semite and Jew,” illustrates how anti-Semites utilize frivolous discourse deliberately. He states, “They are amusing themselves, for it is their adversary who is obliged to use words responsibly since he believes in words” [Sartre 1944, 62]. This manipulation of language is not merely to obscure the absurdity of their arguments but to disorient and intimidate them. When pressed, they disengage, indicating the cessation of rational debate.

In a parallel vein, racist ideologies deeply embedded within fascism have profoundly shaped its rhetoric, mainly through the glorification of the “historical mission” of the Aryan race. This narrative, pivotal to an intensified form of antisemitism in Nazi Germany, positioned Jews as a significant threat. As Andrzej Sylwestrzak notes, this facilitated the projection of internal societal tensions onto the Jewish population, serving as a convenient scapegoat and a mechanism for releasing collective aggression [Sylwestrzak 2022]. This racial ideology, termed ‘Aryanisation’ (German: *die Arisierung*) or ‘German Ancestral Heritage’ (*Deutsches Ahnenerbe*), was rooted in historical and linguistic interpretations that evolved dramatically under Nazi influence. As Philip Gooden and Peter Lewis explain in their monograph “The Word at War,” the term ‘Aryan’ originally had neutral linguistic and ethnographic connotations, derived from the Sanskrit *arya*, meaning ‘noble, of a good family,’ and was associated with the Indo-European language family. By the 19th century, this term was linked to a supposed Aryan race believed to have initially populated northern Europe. However, in Nazi ideology, this concept was distorted to distinguish white Caucasians as superior, directly opposing other racial groups, particularly Jews, with Hitler famously declaring in *Mein Kampf*, “The exact opposite of the Aryan is the Jew” [Gooden and Lewis 2015, 23-24]. This ideological transformation underscores the pernicious use of racial theories to justify antisemitism and societal violence within Nazi rhetoric.

Legal systems address anti-Semitic statements or behaviors using definitions informed by interdisciplinary studies and existing legal interpretations nationally and internationally. This method, enriched by governmental and non-governmental organizations frameworks, promotes a cohesive understanding of anti-Semitism, ensuring that legal assessments are complex, contextually informed, and consistent, thereby enhancing fairness in proceedings related to anti-Semitic incidents.

Although many organizations and institutions have devised their definitions of antisemitism, a universally accepted legal definition remains undefined. However, the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) established a working definition on May 26, 2016, which is widely recognized and used globally as a reference in legal, political, and educational contexts. This definition, primarily educational and not intended as a legal or political tool, describes antisemitism as a perception that may manifest as hostility toward Jews, potentially expressed through actions or words against Jews, non-Jews, their property, and Jewish community institutions.

Since its establishment, the Council of Europe has actively engaged all member states in efforts to combat antisemitism. Key bodies within the Council, specifically the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI) and the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR),

play pivotal roles in setting standards for addressing antisemitism. ECRI focuses on monitoring and analyzing instances of racism and antisemitism, issuing recommendations to member states on effective preventative and remedial measures. Concurrently, the ECHR adjudicates cases involving allegations of antisemitism, providing legal recourse and shaping jurisprudence that influences national policies and practices related to human rights and anti-discrimination. These institutions collectively contribute to a comprehensive approach towards eradicating antisemitism within Europe. Addressing antisemitism through legal frameworks and combating other similar forms of xenophobia might appear, at first, as endeavors unlikely to succeed. The deeply ingrained nature of irrational hostilities and prejudices might suggest that merely implementing provisions from criminal codes or human rights protection treaties would be insufficient to alter behaviors and mind-sets. However, the activities of the Council of Europe, mainly through the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR) and the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI), underscore the potential effectiveness of these legal and institutional mechanisms. As highlighted by Gliszczyńska-Grabias and Wieruszewski in their analysis, “Combating Antisemitism within the Council of Europe – A Balance of Achievements and Failures”, these efforts are not only necessary but have also demonstrated tangible impacts, suggesting that such legal instruments can indeed play a crucial role in mitigating antisemitism and fostering a more inclusive society [Gliszczyńska-Grabias and Wieruszewski 2017]. Combating antisemitism and similar forms of xenophobia through legal instruments poses complex challenges, as deeply entrenched irrational hostilities and prejudices may not be easily influenced by criminal codes or human rights treaties alone. These legal approaches need careful implementation and must be supported by educational and societal interventions to address the multifaceted nature of these issues effectively.

Europe pursues initiatives to combat antisemitism, yet harmonizing legal responses, especially in criminal law, is challenging due to the diverse legal traditions of member states. Such disparities necessitate a nuanced approach to legal integration to effectively address antisemitism across diverse jurisdictions [ibid., 22]. Established in 1993, the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI) assesses state practices. It formulates recommendations to address racism, discrimination, xenophobia, antisemitism, and intolerance in Europe, guiding member states in promoting tolerance and equality.

The Resolution of the European Parliament, adopted on 1 June 2017, titled “Combating Antisemitism” (2017/2692(RSP)), was a response to escalating concerns about the rise in antisemitic incidents across Europe. Published in the Official Journal,<sup>1</sup> this resolution highlights the urgency of addressing

---

<sup>1</sup> OJ C 2018, 307, p. 183.

and mitigating antisemitism as a critical social issue. It underscores the European Parliament's commitment to combatting this prejudice through comprehensive and effective measures, reflecting a concerted effort to reinforce the importance of tolerance and equality within the European community.

The resolution passed by the European Parliament on 1 June 2017 emphasized the necessity for effective measures to combat all manifestations of antisemitism. It urged member states to enhance their collaborative efforts in this area. It also called on the European Commission to appoint an EU Coordinator for Combating Antisemitism. This role is intended to oversee and coordinate activities at the EU level aimed at addressing antisemitism. Additionally, the resolution advocated for the complete adoption by member states of the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) definition of antisemitism. This definition notably includes the identification of certain forms of criticism of Israel that may cross the threshold into antisemitism. By endorsing these measures, the resolution aimed to fortify cooperation and improve the efficacy of strategies to counter antisemitism throughout Europe, marking a significant advancement in the regional commitment to tackling this pressing issue.

On December 2, 2020, the EU Council adopted a Declaration on mainstreaming the fight against antisemitism across policy areas (General Secretariat of the Council, 13637/20). This declaration represents a significant advancement in addressing antisemitism and enhancing the security of Jewish communities and institutions within Europe. The Council outlined specific directives for member states, which include ensuring the protection of Jewish communities and institutions, combating hate speech and hate crimes, promoting Holocaust education and the preservation of Jewish heritage, supporting research and monitoring of antisemitism trends, and implementing the IHRA's working definition of antisemitism. Additionally, the declaration called for robust cooperation and coordination at the EU level, highlighted by the appointment of a coordinator for combating antisemitism and promoting Jewish life. The Council also endorsed the Commission's European Democracy Action Plan, which incorporates strategies to combat antisemitism and safeguard Jewish communities, emphasizing a holistic approach to fostering a secure and inclusive environment.

The legal frameworks designed to address antisemitism within both the universal and European contexts are diverse, demonstrating a commitment to upholding human rights and preventing discrimination. At the universal level, cornerstone documents such as the Charter of the United Nations, the Statute of the International Court of Justice, and the Agreement establishing the Preparatory Commission of the United Nations<sup>2</sup> provide the foundational

---

<sup>2</sup> Journal of Laws of 1947, No. 23, item 90 as amended.

principles of international law and justice. These documents underscore the global imperative to protect human rights and actively prevent discrimination, forming the legal basis from which efforts to combat antisemitism are further developed and implemented. These foundational principles are further reinforced by the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on December 9, 1948.<sup>3</sup> This convention plays a critical role in addressing acts of genocide, including those motivated by antisemitism. The Convention explicitly defines genocide and mandates that signatories undertake to prevent and punish such heinous acts. This legal instrument is integral to the international community's efforts to address and deter grave violations of human rights, particularly those that target specific groups based on ethnic, racial, or religious discrimination.

The International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, which was opened for signature in New York on March 7, 1966,<sup>4</sup> targets explicitly racial discrimination, including antisemitism. This legal framework mandates that state parties adopt various measures to eradicate discrimination in all its forms. The Convention obliges signatories to implement legislative, judicial, and administrative measures to prevent and address discriminatory behaviors, promoting global equality and human dignity. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, which was opened for signature in New York on December 19, 1966,<sup>5</sup> complements these legal instruments by emphasizing the principle of non-discrimination in accessing and enjoying economic, social, and cultural rights. This covenant enforces that all individuals must have equal opportunity to achieve their potential in these critical areas, free from discrimination. Additionally, the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid, adopted on November 30, 1973,<sup>6</sup> while primarily aimed at eliminating apartheid, also addresses broader issues of systemic racial discrimination. This convention establishes a framework for understanding and combating institutionalized forms of racism, including anti-Semitism, by setting legal obligations for state parties to suppress and punish segregation and discrimination, fostering a more inclusive and equitable society.

The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, opened for signature in New York on December 19, 1966,<sup>7</sup> offers further protection by safeguarding civil and political rights, such as freedom of speech and religion and protection from hate speech and discrimination. These protections

---

<sup>3</sup> Journal of Laws of 1952, No. 2, item 9.

<sup>4</sup> Journal of Laws of 1969, No. 25, item 187, annex.

<sup>5</sup> Journal of Laws of 1977, No. 38, item 169, annex.

<sup>6</sup> Journal of Laws of 1976, No. 32, item 186, annex.

<sup>7</sup> Journal of Laws of 1977, No. 38, item 167, annex.

explicitly extend to anti-Semitic acts, ensuring that individuals are shielded from such forms of hatred under international law.

Moreover, the First Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on December 16, 1966,<sup>8</sup> empowers individuals to file complaints with the Human Rights Committee regarding violations of the Covenant, including those connected to antisemitism. This mechanism provides an essential avenue for addressing individual grievances related to discrimination and hate crimes.

Additionally, the Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, aimed at abolishing the death penalty, adopted on December 15, 1989,<sup>9</sup> reflects broader human rights commitments that, while primarily focused on capital punishment, indirectly bolster efforts to combat anti-Semitic hate crimes. This comprehensive framework underscores the international community's dedication to protecting human dignity and combating discrimination in all its forms.

Within the European legal framework, the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, drawn up in Rome on November 4, 1950, provides robust protection for human rights across Europe, including safeguards against discrimination and hate speech, encompassing acts of antisemitism. This Convention establishes the legal basis for preventing and addressing various forms of intolerance, reinforcing Europe's commitment to protecting all individuals from hatred and prejudice.

The Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, drafted in Strasbourg on February 1, 1995, specifically aims to safeguard the rights of national minorities, including Jewish communities, shielding them from discrimination and hostility. This Convention promotes equality and cultural diversity, ensuring that minority groups are protected from societal and institutional biases.

Protocol No. 11 to the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, adopted in Strasbourg on May 11, 1994, encapsulates reforms aimed at enhancing the effectiveness of these protections. This Protocol restructured the European Court of Human Rights, streamlining its procedures to improve its efficiency in handling human rights cases, including those related to antisemitism and discrimination, thus strengthening the overall enforcement of human rights across Europe.

Protocol No. 12 to the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, drawn up in Rome on November 4, 2000, further enhances the European human rights framework. This protocol broadens the non-discrimination protections enshrined in the Convention, explicitly

---

<sup>8</sup> Journal of Laws of 1994, No. 23, item 80.

<sup>9</sup> Journal of Laws 2014, No. 891.



prohibiting discrimination on any ground, including antisemitism. It reinforces the comprehensive protection of individuals against all forms of prejudice.

The Convention on Cybercrime, adopted in Budapest on November 23, 2001, addresses crimes perpetrated through the internet, including the dissemination of antisemitic hate speech and propaganda. The Additional Protocol further bolsters this Convention to the Convention on Cybercrime, drafted in Strasbourg on January 28, 2003, which targets explicitly online hate speech, including content that promotes antisemitism. Together, these instruments offer critical legal frameworks for combating the spread of antisemitic rhetoric in the digital age, ensuring accountability for those who use the internet to propagate hate. Additionally, Protocol No. 14 to the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, adopted in Strasbourg on May 13, 2004, introduces reforms aimed at improving the efficiency of the European Court of Human Rights. These reforms streamline the Court's operations, enabling more effective adjudication of cases involving antisemitic discrimination and hate crimes. Collectively, these protocols and conventions strengthen Europe's legal mechanisms for addressing both traditional and emerging forms of antisemitism. These universal and European legal instruments form a robust framework that prevents and punishes antisemitism, protects human rights, and promotes an inclusive global society by tackling discrimination and hate crimes through a multidimensional approach at both international and regional levels.

Antisemitism, one of human history's oldest and most intricate phenomena, demands particular focus within the legal protection framework. Contemporary research highlights a resurgence of antisemitism globally, posing significant challenges for societies in terms of safeguarding minority rights. In Europe, movements such as PEGIDA, which gained traction in Germany, have not only underscored growing tensions between ethnic groups but also revealed a marked increase in antisemitic incidents, often intertwined with other forms of discrimination [Pries and Bekassow 2015]. In the political sphere, antisemitism transcends being a mere social issue and has historically been exploited as a tool by regimes to consolidate power. A notable example is the Vichy regime's actions in Tunisia, where the imposition of racial antisemitic laws served to bolster French dominance in the region [Peterson 2014]. These examples underscore the need for robust legal mechanisms to address the complex and multifaceted nature of antisemitism in modern society.

In Europe, like elsewhere, there has been a noticeable increase in discriminatory policies that risk marginalizing minorities, including Jews. In response to these developments, the European Union has introduced various legal mechanisms aimed at combating antisemitism, such as directives that prohibit the public approval, denial, or trivialization of the Holocaust [Dudek 2023].



However, it is essential to acknowledge that these measures are often insufficient, and their effectiveness largely hinges on the commitment of member states to implement and rigorously enforce these regulations. As emphasized in the Opinion of the European Committee of the Regions on the EU Strategy for Combating Antisemitism and Supporting Jewish Life (2021-2030),<sup>10</sup> one of the most widespread contemporary manifestations of antisemitism is that which is linked to Israel. This form of antisemitism often manifested through disproportionate criticism or the delegitimization of Israel, highlights the evolving and complex nature of antisemitism in modern European discourse, necessitating a more targeted and robust legal response. European Jews frequently experience this form of antisemitism in online spaces, with an alarming 79% reporting that they feel blamed for the actions of the State of Israel.

Additionally, 69% of respondents state that the Arab-Israeli conflict has a considerable impact on their sense of security.<sup>11</sup> These findings underscore the growing prevalence of antisemitic sentiments tied to geopolitical issues, which further complicates the already challenging environment faced by Jewish communities in Europe, particularly in the digital sphere. This highlights the need for complex strategies that extend beyond legal and educational measures and also include political and social actions aimed at combating the evolving nature of antisemitism. While robust legal frameworks are essential for prosecuting hate crimes and preventing discrimination, they must be complemented by sustained educational initiatives that promote understanding and tolerance, particularly regarding the complexities of the Arab-Israeli conflict and its misuse in fostering antisemitic attitudes. Moreover, political leadership is crucial in shaping public discourse and implementing policies that protect minority communities, while social interventions – such as awareness campaigns and community engagement – play a key role in fostering a more inclusive society. Addressing antisemitism requires a holistic approach, with a strong emphasis on education, to dismantle the prejudices and misinformation that fuel hate.

It is essential to address the role of digital spaces, as the contemporary context amplifies the presence and spread of antisemitism online. In these environments, antisemitic content can disseminate rapidly, exacerbating feelings of insecurity and vulnerability within Jewish communities. Consequently, comprehensive strategies must be developed to regulate online content, enhance digital literacy, and promote accountability within social media platforms. These efforts should be reinforced by coordinated legal and political

<sup>10</sup> Official Journal of the European Union, 2022, C 375, p. 21.

<sup>11</sup> European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, *Experiences and Perceptions of Antisemitism – Second Survey on Discrimination and Hate Crime Against Jews in the EU (2018)*, [https://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra\\_uploads/fra-2018-experiences-and-perceptions-of-antisemitism-survey\\_en.pdf](https://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra_uploads/fra-2018-experiences-and-perceptions-of-antisemitism-survey_en.pdf) [accessed: 20.08.2024].

measures to effectively combat the evolving nature of antisemitism in the digital age. In the context of legal protections against antisemitism, it is crucial to examine how the law can simultaneously serve as a mechanism of protection and marginalization for different groups. Research indicates that legal systems in Western countries are not always as neutral or objective as they appear, often reflecting and reinforcing existing social hierarchies [Riedel 2021]. For Jewish communities, history demonstrates that the law has been used as a tool of persecution, most notably during the Holocaust, while also serving as a means of protection, as seen in the post-World War II reintegration of Jews in Europe [Sacerdoti 2023]. Contemporary scholarship highlights the importance of incorporating education on religious and cultural diversity into curricula as a critical strategy for combating antisemitism and other forms of discrimination [Ben-Moshe and Halafoff 2014].

The role of media and technology in propagating antisemitism is also critical to highlight. In recent years, particularly following terrorist attacks in Europe, there has been a noticeable rise in antisemitic rhetoric within online spaces, posing new challenges for legislators [Schroeder 2023]. In response, some EU member states have started to implement regulations targeting online hate speech, representing an essential step toward protecting minorities, including Jewish communities, from violence and discrimination [ibid.].

Historically, antisemitism has frequently been employed as a political instrument, as evidenced by Italy during Mussolini's regime, where the implementation of racial laws not only marginalized Jews but also served to consolidate the regime's authority [Luconi 2004]. Contemporary research indicates that many of the enduring tropes and stereotypes associated with antisemitism continue to persist today, underscoring the need for active societal interventions to counter these harmful narratives [Hirsh and Miller 2022]. In this context, education and raising social awareness are essential in the fight against antisemitism, which is pivotal in promoting tolerance and fostering mutual understanding among diverse ethnic and religious communities [Cox 2021].

Current research on antisemitism and its legal protection underscores the necessity of an integrated approach that combines legislative, educational, and social measures. While the introduction of effective legal frameworks to protect minorities from violence and discrimination is essential, equally vital is fostering social awareness about both the historical and contemporary manifestations of antisemitism [Dudek 2023]. Collaboration between institutions, non-governmental organizations, and local communities is essential for promoting tolerance and justice, fostering a society where individuals are granted equal rights and respect. This multifaceted approach ensures sustainable efforts to combat antisemitism.

In a global context, antisemitism transcends local boundaries, manifesting as an international issue that requires cooperation among states

to combat this phenomenon effectively. Collaborative efforts to protect the rights of minorities, including Jewish communities, are crucial in addressing the growing antisemitic tendencies observed in various parts of the world [Cox 2021]. Contemporary research reveals that antisemitism is often intertwined with other forms of discrimination, highlighting the need for an integrated approach to tackle these interconnected issues [Farris 2014]. In this regard, education on diversity and tolerance and promoting intercultural dialogue play a pivotal role in fostering a more just and equitable society.

## 2. RESEARCH AND RESULTS

The research for this paper aimed to explore the perspectives of university educators on the importance of teaching the Holocaust and its relevance in modern education. The study was conducted at one of the most rapidly developing higher education institutions in Poland, which offers a variety of degrees, including law, economics, international relations, and psychology. While lacking a dedicated history department, students are introduced to significant historical events through courses on EU integration, human rights, political systems, and political thought.

The research design included a survey distributed to 22 academic staff members. Respondents, who varied in age, gender, and academic qualifications, voluntarily participated in the survey. This diverse group of educators ranged from master's degree candidates to full professors representing various academic specializations. The survey's primary aim was to gather insights into the educators' views on the importance of Holocaust education, the educational goals they prioritize, and the key lessons students should learn from this historical event.

### *Respondents, Methodology, and Key Findings*

The respondents represented a variety of backgrounds, as outlined below:

Age	%	Gender	%	Education	%
30 years or under	1 (4%)	Men	12 (54%)	Master of Arts (Doctoral Dissertation in progress)	1 (4%)
31-40	3 (14%)	Women	7 (32%)	Doctoral Degree	7 (32%)
41-50	10 (45%)	Other	3 (14%)	Doctoral Degree with Habilitation	10 (45%)
Over 50	8 (37%)			Full Professorship	4 (19%)
Total	22 (100%)		22 (100%)		22 (100%)

Table 1. Demographic Breakdown of Respondents by Age, Gender, and Education Level. Source: Authors' elaboration.

The survey comprised open-ended questions designed to grasp the participants' perspectives on the importance of Holocaust education. It concentrated

on three main research areas: the importance of teaching the Holocaust, the primary educational objectives in teaching about the Holocaust, and the key lessons students should learn from studying the Holocaust.

The qualitative analysis of responses identified key themes and trends, with the diversity of the respondents enriching the findings. Several recurring themes emerged regarding the importance of Holocaust education, focusing on fostering critical thinking, societal awareness, and empathy among students.

Respondents emphasized that Holocaust education helps students reflect on its causes (propaganda, discrimination, societal indifference, etc.) and recognize similar patterns in modern society. Teaching personal stories of victims and survivors, especially those of a similar age to students, effectively fostered empathy and made historical events more relatable. Holocaust education was also viewed as essential for preventing future atrocities, with respondents stressing the importance of understanding incremental steps, such as propaganda and discriminatory policies, that lead to genocide.

Many respondents highlighted the need to contextualize the Holocaust within the broader history of antisemitism and genocide, emphasizing deeply rooted ideologies like the Aryan Race Theory. Drawing parallels with other genocides, such as those in Rwanda and Cambodia, was suggested to provide a global perspective on the dangers of unchecked hatred. Respondents also underscored the role of propaganda in facilitating the Holocaust, noting its relevance to critically evaluating media and disinformation today.

Finally, respondents highlighted the contemporary relevance of Holocaust education in combating rising antisemitism and Holocaust denial, particularly in the context of current political events like the war in Ukraine. They also emphasized its importance in conveying moral and ethical lessons on human rights, justice, and equality, inspiring students to advocate for a more compassionate society.

## CONCLUSION

Antisemitism remains a complex phenomenon that demands a multi-dimensional approach to combat it effectively. While legal protections against antisemitism are indispensable, fostering social awareness and promoting tolerance within society are equally critical. The study highlights the necessity of collaboration between educational institutions, governmental and non-governmental organizations, and local communities to effectively combat antisemitism, enhance awareness, promote inclusivity, and protect minority rights. The survey results reflect a strong commitment among the teaching staff to ensure that students acquire a deep and critical understanding of the Holocaust. Educators view Holocaust education as essential

not only for preserving the memory of past atrocities but also as a crucial tool for equipping students with the knowledge and analytical skills necessary to recognize and combat modern-day manifestations of hatred, racism, and discrimination. The research presented in this paper highlights the need for an integrated approach to Holocaust education, combining historical awareness, critical thinking, and ethical engagement. From a legal perspective, incorporating knowledge of international frameworks, such as those established by the IHRA and the European Court of Human Rights, equips students to understand the legal mechanisms available to combat antisemitism and hate speech. Politically, examining the role of state policies and regimes, both historical and contemporary, sheds light on how political structures can either reinforce or dismantle antisemitic ideologies. Linguistically, understanding how language and propaganda have been used historically to spread antisemitic views and how they persist in modern discourse helps students critically assess the power of words in shaping societal attitudes. By incorporating legal, political, and linguistic dimensions into the curriculum, educators can better prepare students to address contemporary issues of discrimination and violence. In light of the growing levels of antisemitism worldwide, proactive measures must be taken to protect human rights and uphold democratic values. Expanding Holocaust education with a multidimensional framework will not only help prevent future atrocities but also foster a more informed, tolerant, and just society.

#### REFERENCES

- Ben-Moshe, Danny, and Anna Halafoff. 2014. "Antisemitism and Jewish Children and Youth in Australia's Capital Territory Schools." *Social Inclusion* 2, no. 2:47-56. <https://doi.org/10.17645/si.v2i2.166>
- Cox, Caroline. 2021. "Addressing Anti-Semitism in Social Work Education." *Journal of Religion & Spirituality in Social Work: Social Thought* 40, no. 2:111-25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15426432.2020.1871155>
- Dudek, Claudia. 2023. "The EU's Combating Antisemitism Policy: Agenda Setting and the Making of a 'European Polity'." *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies* 62, no. 3: 671-87. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcms.13521>
- Farris, Sara. 2014. "From the Jewish Question to the Muslim Question: Republican Rigorism, Culturalist Differentialism, and Antinomies of Enforced Emancipation." *Constellations* 21, no. 2:296-307. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8675.12087>
- Gliszczynska-Grabias, Agnieszka, and Roman Wieruszewski. 2017. "Przeciwdziałanie antysemityzmowi w ramach Rady Europy – bilans osiągnięć i porażek." *EPS* 2:21-25.
- Gooden, Philip, and Peter Lewis. 2015. *The Word at War*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc.
- Hirsh, David, and Henry Miller. 2022. "Durban Antizionism: Its Sources, Its Impact, and Its Relation to Older Anti-Jewish Ideologies." *Journal of Contemporary Antisemitism* 5, no. 1:21-36. <https://doi.org/10.26613/jca/5.1.98>

- Luconi, Stefano. 2004. "Il Grido della Stirpe and Mussolini's 1938 Racial Legislation." *Shofar: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Jewish Studies* 22, no. 4:67-79. <https://doi.org/10.1353/sho.2004.0102>
- Peterson, Tasha. 2015. "The 'Jewish Question' and the 'Italian Peril': Vichy, Italy, and the Jews of Tunisia, 1940-42." *Journal of Contemporary History* 50, no. 2:234-58. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022009414542537>
- Pries, Ludger, and Nazim Bekassow. 2015. "Discrimination and Racism in the European Union: Diagnostic of a Neglected Challenge and the Corresponding Scientific Research." *Sociologias* 17, no. 40:176-211. <https://doi.org/10.1590/15174522-017004005>
- Riedel, Mathias. 2021. "Law and the Construction of Jewish Difference." *Journal of Law and Society* 48, no. 2:158-78. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jols.12297>
- Sacerdoti, Giorgio. 2023. "Il lungopercorso dal dopoguerra a oggi (1944-2023): dal ripristino dei diritti degli ebrei vittime delle leggi razziste dell'Italia fascista al recupero della memoria per lottare contro il pregiudizio e l'antisemitismo." *Stato, Chiesa e Pluralismo Confessionale*. <https://doi.org/10.54103/1971-8543/19834>
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. 1944. *Anti-Semite and Jew*. Translated by George J. Becker. In James Mann, *Antisemitism: The Oldest Hatred*, 61-67. London: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc.
- Schroeder, Walter. 2023. "A Step Forward in Fighting Online Antisemitism." <https://doi.org/10.59704/4635febdf48976a>
- Sylwestrzak, Andrzej. 2022. "Rozdział XXXIV: Doktryna państwa faszystowskiego." In *Historia doktryn politycznych i prawnych*. Lex el.
- Wistrich, Robert S. 1994. *Antisemitism: The Longest Hatred*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Wistrich, Robert S. 2010. *A Lethal Obsession: Anti-Semitism from Antiquity to the Global Jihad*. New York: Random House Publishing Group.